APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/611,639	07/01/2003	Jin Li	13768.1380	1386

47973   7590   04/29/2010
WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER
KENDALL, CHUCK O

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2192	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/29/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/611,639	LI ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CHUCK O. KENDALL	2192	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>17 February 2010</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
         application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail. Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

1.   This is in response to application filed 02/17/10.

2.   Claims 1 – 30 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1 - 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being

unpatentable over Beaumont et al. US 2004/0073511 A1 in view of Burke

5,423,041.

      Regarding claims 1, 21 – 26, and 30 Beaumont discloses a system

facilitating rule composition comprising:

      a rule composer that in response to a user input facilitates at least one

of creation and modification of a rule, the rule composer further receiving

information associated with the at least one of creation and modification of

the rule based, and a display component that displays hierarchical

information associated with the rule [0045 – 0046 see modify rules, or

create rules, also see paragraph 0046, for building blocks of rules and tree

hierarchy]

Beaumont doesn't expressly disclose wherein the rule base is at least

in part, upon natural language inline editing.

However, Burke in an analogous art and similar configuration of

composing rules in an object oriented language environment discloses

creating and modification of class instances as well as user defined classes

and rule sequences for a particular language (1:55 - 2: 15).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

at the time the invention was made to combine Beaumont and Burke,

because it would enable devising a rule set for a particular object oriented

language as suggested by Burke above.

Regarding claim 2, the system of claim 1, further comprising an input

component that facilitates receipt of information associated with the at least

one of creation and modification of the rule [Beaumont 0015] also see Burke

FIG. 2.

Regarding claim 3, the system of claim 1, the rule being a business
rule [0051].

Regarding claim 4, the system of claim 1, the rule being based, at
least in part, upon a parameterized format string definition [0050, see
configure, and code packets].

Regarding claim 5, the system of claim 1, the rule being based, at
least in part, upon a composable vocabulary definition [0028, see additional
definition or rule].

Regarding claim 6, the system of claim 1, the display component
facilitating a user interface comprising a first splitting panel and a second
splitting panel [0028, see display].

Regarding claims 7 and 27, the system of claim 6, wherein the first
splitting panel facilitates building a condition associated with the rule [0028].

Regarding claim 8, the system of claim 6, wherein the second splitting
panel facilitates building an action associated with the rule [0028, see first

and second list].

Regarding claim 9, the system of claim 1, wherein editing focus can be transferred from a node associated with the node visually accentuated to represent a parent-child relationship [0046, see tree and hierarchy].

Regarding claim 10, the system of claim 1, the display component facilitating a user interface comprising a property window that displays a property of anode of the hierarchical information [0046].

Regarding claim 11, the system of claim 1, the rule comprising a condition [0011, see condition].

Regarding claim 12, the system of claim 11, the condition comprising at least one of a logical and, a logical not and a logical or [0012, see logical expression].

Regarding claim 13, the system of claim 1, the display component facilitating display of a context menu associated with at least one of an action and a condition associated with the rule [0045].

Regarding claim 14, the system of claim 1, the display component facilitating a user interface comprising at least one of adjust splitting panels, a drag and drop operation, and, a clipboard operation [Examiner is taking official notice on the use of copy and pasting and the use of clipboard operation as such operations are well known in the art].

Regarding claim 15, the system of claim 1 the rule composer comprising a rule editor and a policy explorer [0045].

Regarding claim 16, the system of claim 1 the rule composer facilitating editing of a parameter having a range [0045].

Regarding claim 17, the system of claim 1 the rule composer facilitating editing of an unconstrained parameter [0045].

Regarding claim 18, the system of claim 1, the rule composer facilitating editing of a parameter having a value in a set of values [0045 and 0058].

Regarding claim 19, the system of claim 1, the rule composer facilitating type compatibility checking [0058, see simulation as interpeted].

Regarding claim 20, the system of claim 1 the rule composer facilitating error checking and providing error information to the display component if an error is found [0045-0046].

Regarding claim 28, the user interface of claim 26, the rule editor region comprising an action region that displays information associated with an action associated with the rule [0045-0058].

Regarding claim 29, the user interface of claim 26, further comprising a property condition region that displays information associated with a property of a node of the hierarchical information associated with the policy [0045-0059].

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 29 have been considered but not persuasive to overcome the previous rejection.

Applicant argues on page 8 of his recent response that the prior art doesn't disclose natural inline editing. Examiner disagrees, as disclosed in prior art Burke discloses creating and modification of class instances as well as user defined classes and rule sequences for a particular language (1:55 - 2: 15). Applicant's plain language of claims merely discloses creation and modification of the rule based, at least in part, upon natural language inline editing, as such a natural language based on the claimed limitations could be construed as any programmable language or user defined language as such. If the meaning of natural language is intended to be different than what is claimed, provisions should be made to clarify the definition within the claim language as supported by the specification in order to properly and distinctly present that particular claim limitation.

Correspondence Information

5.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chuck Kendall whose telephone number is 571-272-3698. The examiner can normally be reached between Monday and Thursday, at 11:00 am - 4:300pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Dam can be reached on 571-272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Chuck O Kendall/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2192